



**REPORT ON THE FOLLOW-UP PHASE OF THE AFRICAN WORLD  
HERITAGE SITES NOMINATIONS TRAINING COURSE  
2008 TO 2009**

**Maseru, LESOTHO**



**With the support of:**



## INTRODUCTION

The African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) in conjunction with partners such as the UNESCO-World Heritage Centre, together with strategic training institutional partners, the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa (CHDA), and its sister institution Ecole du Patrimoine Africain (EPA), developed a training course on the development of nomination dossiers for World Heritage listing. Its main objective is to increase the number of African heritage sites on the World Heritage List.

In spite of its very rich cultural and natural heritage, Africa has continued to have the least number of sites represented on the World Heritage List and its immense diversity has not been recognised and valorised.

The training programme, therefore, seeks to build an increased level of competence (capacity) amongst African heritage professionals in the development of successful nomination dossiers. Ultimately, this would increase the number of African sites on the World Heritage List. Initially, a total of 9 nominations were targeted to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 2010 but that number has since been revised.

Other results of this program would be a reduction in the number of heritage properties on the World Heritage List in Danger and most importantly, through the mentoring process, the development of a network of competent, trained and experienced heritage professionals from which the continent can draw capacity.

The course brought together 19 participants from 9 African State Parties. Eleven resource persons from across the African continent and international agencies contributed their expertise on how a successful nomination process should be undertaken.

After the training, participants, with their mentors and their carefully designed Action Plans returned to the field to continue the work of preparing their dossiers.

During this follow-up phase, running from November 2008 to November 2009, a part of the coordination team met in Johannesburg to discuss the progress made in Phase 2. Measures were discussed to ensure that the momentum was maintained, the successes enhanced and the challenges faced in the coordination of the entire program were addressed.

The coordinators of the Maseru and Porto Novo nomination training courses met in an attempt to form synergies within the broad regions of English- and French-speaking Africa providing a platform for shared experiences and ideas with particular regard to the nomination process. During the meetings, the African World Heritage Fund was represented.

## **1.0 SUCCESSES**

- 1.1 There are seven successful dossiers nearing completion with submission aimed for 2010. These are Ghana, Egypt, Lesotho, Kenya, Swaziland and two (2) from Nigeria;
- 1.2 Though four (4) State Parties might not meet the 2010 benchmark as was initially envisioned by the coordination team, their dossiers are planned for 2011 submission;
- 1.3 The capacity developed in Phase 1 is reflected in the superior quality of the reports and work received and evaluated by the co-ordination team thus far;
- 1.4 Five State Parties (Botswana, Mozambique, Nigeria for 2 sites, Swaziland, Zambia) have submitted their requests for funding to the African World Heritage Fund and to date, Swaziland has been funded. The not yet funded States Parties still have to complete their requests. Lesotho had already been granted by AWHF in 2008 for Tentative Listing and Nomination Dossier for Sehlabathebe National Park;
- 1.5 African heritage experts who in most cases, apply their capacities within international forums and at senior levels within the profession, are sharing and ensuring continuity through the mentoring of young African heritage professionals;
- 1.6 The process of enhancing existing networks of African heritage professionals on the continent has effectively begun;
- 1.7 Botswana has organised a national World Heritage Committee;
- 1.8 The initial brief of the training has been extended to include reviewing dossiers from State Parties out of the 2008 trained participants. Nigeria is one such and is sending one participant to the follow-up session to submit another site that had been previously deferred.

## **2.0 CHALLENGES**

- 2.1 Various parties, stakeholders and structures of communication within the training brief;
- 2.2 Effective, direct follow-up mechanisms need to be planned and budgeted for. (For example: In the case of Egypt who had not been communicating or providing reports and updates for a long period. It would have been desirable to have had allocation for the Co-ordinator, or a member of the co-ordinating team to travel and meet with representatives of the State Party team;
- 2.3 Perceived lack of prioritisation from some State Parties;
- 2.4 Varying institutional frameworks and processes and standards of operations;
- 2.5 Resource allocation within the Project budget insufficient for administrative expenses;
- 2.6 Some mentors have not met their contractual obligations by physically visiting the sites;
- 2.7 Lack of regular reporting by the State Party teams;
- 2.8 Delays by State Parties in applying for funds;
- 2.9 Some State Parties have chosen to fit the nomination process within their overall government planning which has caused delays;

2.10 Changing the composition and size of nomination teams by the responsible authorities within State Party.

### **3.0 WEAKNESSES**

- 3.1 State Parties such as Egypt and Lesotho have not provided a single progress report and there is no mechanism for active follow up, except through email;
- 3.2 Most of the mentors were not involved with the preparation of the Action Plans and pertinent issues were not captured at conception thereby slowing down the pace of progress;
- 3.3 Stipend was not made available to the coordination team for administration purposes;
- 3.4 The coordination team's inability to visit sites that are being nominated;
- 3.5 The coordination team's inability to utilise State Party contacts to create enough diplomatic pressure in pushing for progress with the nomination process;
- 3.6 Though it had been recommended at the preparatory phase to communicate to State Parties directing them to give time off to staff for the nomination process, that communication is yet to be officially made.

### **4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1.1 There must be a standardised framework and mechanism for reporting which would be both reporting on progress and identification of the next steps. Reports should identify "Red Flags" or potential risks to the fulfilment of the State Party obligation and provide mitigating factors.
- 1.2 An overarching Communication Strategy between all the participants, mentors, Resource Persons and co-ordinating team needs to be developed with specific resource allocations
- 1.3 The co-ordination teams from both the Maseru and Benin courses should continue to communicate.
- 1.4 Site visits for follow up, inspection and in special cases, interventions to be made needs to be planned and budgeted for.
- 1.5 Should intervention be required at a diplomatic level with individual State Parties, a process needs to be identified by the co-ordination team.

Table 1: Detailed Progress Chart

NO.	STATE PARTY	SITE AND TYPE OF PROPERTY TO BE NOMINATED	MENTOR	UPDATE	CHALLENGES	COMMENTS
1	<b>BOTSWANA</b> Ms. Getrude Matswiri Mr. Mohutsiwa Gbadirwe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makgadikgadi Salt Pans as a Cultural Landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-established the national WHC</li> <li>Has submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Submitted contacts Mentors and experts yet to be identified as Site has not been identified conclusively</li> <li>Has submitted Funding form to AWHF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor IT (computers, internet)</li> <li>Office commitments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will draw up nomination plan for selected site by July 2009</li> <li>State Party submitting in 2011 to allow for review of Tentative List and conduct the necessary research</li> <li>Considering reviewing the TL and might change focus to another property</li> </ul>
2	<b>EGYPT</b> Mr. Sayed ABU BKR Mr. Abdel Aziz Al Dumairy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ras Mohammed National Park as a Natural Site</li> <li>Is considering Siwa for nomination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has not yet submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Had not been communicating with the Coordination</li> <li>No updates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not submitted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initially, no feedback from SP</li> <li>Recently announced intentions to withdraw from nomination</li> <li>Encouraged to attempt Siwa nomination</li> </ul>

NO.	STATE PARTY	SITE AND TYPE OF PROPERTY TO BE NOMINATED	MENTOR	UPDATE	CHALLENGES	COMMENTS
3	<b>GHANA</b>  Mr. Anthony Owusu  Mr. Simon Lawer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tongo Tengzuk as a Cultural Landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Khensani Maluleke REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Identified mentor and are working with him</li> <li>Has submitted part of nomination dossier</li> <li>Has submitted draft Management Plan</li> <li>Intends to visit sites in Togo and Mali for comparative analyses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One man local team; other participant not applying himself</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitting in 2010</li> <li>SP making tremendous progress as have submitted draft dossier and Management Plan</li> </ul>

NO.	STATE PARTY	SITE AND TYPE OF PROPERTY TO BE NOMINATED	MENTOR	UPDATE	CHALLENGES	COMMENTS
4	<b>KENYA</b>  Ms. Elizabeth <b>Leitoro</b>  Mr. Hoseah <b>Wanderi</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kenyan Lakes System as a Natural Site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dr George Abungu KENYA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Held national WHC stakeholder meetings</li> <li>Updated tentative list</li> <li>Concentrating on Lakes Elemataita, Nakuru and Bogoria</li> <li>Team to map site identified</li> <li>One Management Plan for the three lake system stakeholders</li> <li>Consultative Forum September 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not submitted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gazettement of Lake Elemaitata by May 2009</li> <li>Funding from Nordic World Heritage Fund through the AWHF</li> <li>Submission date 2010 as funders insist monies must be expended by year end 2009</li> <li>SP making tremendous progress in spite of the size of property</li> </ul>

NO.	STATE PARTY	SITE AND TYPE OF PROPERTY TO BE NOMINATED	MENTOR	UPDATE	CHALLENGES	COMMENTS
5	<b>LESOTHO</b>  Ms. Emily <b>Molibeli</b>  Ms. Refileo <b>Ntsohi</b>  Mr. Khosto <b>Kobisi</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sethlabathebe National Park as a Mixed Site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roger Porter (Frans Prins) REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Reviewed but comments not addressed</li> <li>Had pre-meeting liaison (telephone) with mentor</li> <li>Not requested funding from AWHF</li> <li>No updates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None submitted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP is moving rather slow and has not been submitting updates</li> <li>Disheartening as it is the host for the course and would have inspired participants with tremendous progress</li> </ul>
6	<b>MOZAMBIQUE</b>  Mr. Jopela <b>Albino</b>  Mr. Brazao <b>Catopola</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quirimbas Archipelago as a Mixed Site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invitation letter written and sent. Waiting for response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Submission of nomination dependant on overall government programme</li> <li>Has submitted Funding form to AWHF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preparation of Mgmt Plan and Dossier to be included in govt programme</li> <li>One man team; other participant not applying himself to process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waiting for response from proposed mentor</li> <li>List of national experts to be sent after government involvement in planning</li> <li>Action Plan states submission in Sept 2010 for 2011</li> <li>To set up a nomination working team in March 2010</li> </ul>

NO.	STATE PARTY	SITE AND TYPE OF PROPERTY TO BE NOMINATED	MENTOR	UPDATE	CHALLENGES	COMMENTS
7	<b>NIGERIA</b>  Ms. Victoria <b>Osuagwu</b>  Mr. Garba <b>Hassan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surame as a Cultural Landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baba Ceesay THE GAMBIA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Has had pre-meeting liaison (by phone) with mentor (Baba Ceesay)</li> <li>National expert committee set up</li> <li>Has submitted Funding form to AWHF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erratic power supply</li> <li>Constant loss of server affecting internet</li> <li>Researchers do not reside in same area affecting pace of work</li> <li>Inadequate funding</li> <li>Official assignments affecting progress</li> <li>Strikes by workers within Ministry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentor has not visited site</li> <li>Submission set for 2010</li> <li>Has not accessed funding</li> <li>Too much desktop research</li> </ul>
8	<b>SWAZILAND</b>  Ms. Dudu <b>Nkambule</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ngwenya Mines as a Cultural Landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Janette Deacon REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted Action Plan</li> <li>Local Team identified for nomination</li> <li>Has had pre-meeting liaison with mentor</li> <li>Have been funded by the AWHF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate funding</li> <li>Inadequate local human capacity- need expertise from outside State Party</li> <li>Mr. James Kunene dropped from team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Might have to compare with Gava Mine in Spain</li> <li>Might include SP in Barberton/ Makhonjwa Mountain nomination. Team to assess potential (JD, GP, RP)</li> <li>Submission set for 2010</li> </ul>

NO.	STATE PARTY	SITE AND TYPE OF PROPERTY TO BE NOMINATED	MENTOR	UPDATE	CHALLENGES	COMMENTS
9	<b>ZAMBIA</b>  Mr. Muyumbwa Ndiyoi  Mr. Richard Mbewe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barotse Landscape as a Cultural Landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dawson Munjeri ZIMBABWE (UNESCO)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted Action Plan</li> <li>AP reviewed but comments not addressed</li> <li>Has had field trip with mentor</li> <li>Has submitted Funding form to AWHF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes in institutional senior management affecting pace of work</li> <li>Team composition not consistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission set for 2011 due to lack of adequate information and research</li> <li>Being funded by Africa 2009</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Coordination</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress has been made in that a number of State Parties have been given impetus to undertake the nomination. Ghana has already submitted part of the dossier.</li> <li>Others are at different levels of progress but it is gratifying to note that a number are working in spite of their own challenges</li> <li>However, some challenges have occurred for the coordination team where some State Parties are totally out of reach which has been compounded due to the inability of the coordination to communicate (by phone, for example) with them</li> <li>These challenges are as a result of a lack of budget to the coordination team to accommodate Internet, faxes and phones- they are working solely using their own resources</li> <li>Letters to National Directors compelling them to release the participants are yet to be written and this has to a certain extent, delayed progress</li> </ul>						

Table 2: Summary of Progress

<b>No</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>No. of Progress Reports submitted</b>	<b>*Progress against Action Plan</b>	<b>Maintaining Team Consistency</b>	<b>Year of Submission</b>	<b>Mentoring</b>
<b>1</b>	Botswana	1	2	Good	2011	Not available
<b>2</b>	Egypt	0	1	Info not available	2011	Not available
<b>3</b>	Ghana	5	4	1 member team	2010	Very good
<b>4</b>	Kenya	3	4	Good	2010	Very good
<b>5</b>	Lesotho	1	2	Info not availed	2010	Not available
<b>6</b>	Mozambique	1	1	1 member dropped	2011	Not available
<b>7</b>	Nigeria	2 with 2 updates	3	Good	2010	Satisfactory
<b>8</b>	Swaziland	2	2	1 member dropped	2010	Just commencing
<b>9</b>	Zambia	1 with 1 update	2	Team changed often	2011	Satisfactory

\*On a scale of **5** (very good) to **1** (poor)